

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 were pending in the application. Claims 12-24 stand withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-11 and 25-31 stand rejected:

- Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention;
- Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 25, 27-29 and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,382,986);
- Claims 4-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker (US 5,788,510), previously cited in Paper No. 2; and
- Claims 2, 9, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Koyama et al. (US 6,382,983).

The drawings are objected to, as failing to show structural aspects of the invention recited in the claims. Specifically, the drawings are required to show the socket body, plurality of adjacent contacts on surfaces of first and second memory modules, and the socket body being arranged to load first and second memory modules in opposite directions.

In this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-25, 28 and 31 are canceled; claims 2, 4, 8-9, 26-27 and 29-30 are amended; and new claims 32-41 are added.

Claims 2, 4, 8-9, 26-27, 29-30 and 32-41 currently are pending. In addition, Applicant makes the following remarks regarding the rejections:

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to. Figure 9C is amended herein to add reference numeral 93, corresponding to adjacent contacts on prior art memory modules 91,92. Such contacts are well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art; no new matter is added. The other grounds for objection—failure to depict modules loaded in opposite directions—has been mooted by cancellation of claims 10 and 31.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification is amended herein to add textual reference for numeral 93 in Figure 9C, corresponding to adjacent contacts on prior art memory modules 91,92. Such contacts are well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art; no new matter is added.

Claims rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4, 8, and 29 have been amended to remove the antecedent basis issue. The remaining claims were rejected only as depending from the above claims or have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims Rejections –35 USC § 102

Pending claims 8, 27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,382,986). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims Rejections –35 USC § 102

Pending claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker (US 5,788,510). The rejection is respectfully traversed, although it is believed mooted by the present amendments.

Claim 4 is amended herein to make clear that it is directed to a through socket structured to connect to memory modules loaded into a base socket. Exemplary embodiments are shown in Applicant's Figures 6 and 15A. These embodiments are readily seen to couple to memory modules loaded in a base socket mounted to a PCB, the through sockets not attached to the PCB.

In contrast, the socket of Walker '510 is expressly taught to be mounted on a mounting board. (Walker '510, col. 3, lines 6-8.)

The through socket recited in amended claim 4 therefore is patentably distinct from the base socket of Walker '510.

Claims Rejections –35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 2, 9, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim '986 in view of Koyama et al. (US 6,382,983). These claims have been rewritten in independent form, incorporating the limitations of the base claims from which they previously were depended. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant avers herein that Kim '986 and the present application share a common assignee, namely Applicant Samsung Electronics Co, Ltd. The application which matured

into Kim '987 was commonly owned by Applicant, or subject to an obligation to assign same to Applicant, at the time the present invention was made.

Accordingly, Kim '986 is not a reference "by another" and therefore is not prior art under 35 USC § 102(e)/103(a). See MPEP 706.02(b); 715.01(b). Absent Kim '986, Koyama '983 alone fails to teach or fairly suggest the claimed invention, and claims 2, 9, 26 and 30 therefore are patentable over Koyama '983.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 4, 8-9, 26-27, 29-30 and 32-41 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Alan T. McCollom
Reg. No. 28,881

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613